

Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554

ORIGINAL  
RECEIVED

OCT 12 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

In the Matter of )

Amendment of Part 90 of the )  
Commission's Rules to Provide )  
for the Use of the 220-222 MHz )  
Band by the Private Land Mobile )  
Radio Service )

PR Docket No. 89-552  
RM-8506

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Implementation of Sections 3(n) )  
and 332 of the Communications Act )

GN Docket No. 93-252

Regulatory Treatment of Mobile )  
Services )

Implementation of Section 309(j) )  
of the Communications Act -- )  
Competitive Bidding, 220-222 MHz )

PP Docket No. 93-253

To: The Commission

**REPLY COMMENTS OF GLOBAL CELLULAR COMMUNICATIONS, INC.**

Global Cellular Communications, Inc. ("Global"), by its attorneys and pursuant to Section 1.415 of the Federal Communication Commission's ("Commission") Rules, respectfully submits its Reply Comments respecting the above-entitled proceeding.<sup>1</sup>

Global currently holds a license for a nationwide, commercial 220-222 MHz system. These Reply Comments address the question of greater technical and operational flexibility for the 220-222 MHz band as proposed by the Commission.

<sup>1</sup> Second Memorandum Opinion and Order and Third Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, PR Docket No. 89-552, 10 FCC Rcd \_\_\_\_ (1995) ("Notice").

No. of Copies rec'd  
LIBRARY

084

In its Comments, the American Mobile Telecommunications Association, Inc. ("AMTA") noted that narrowband technology had not had sufficient time to gain marketplace acceptance for manufacturers to recover the significant costs in developing narrowband technology. Nevertheless, AMTA supported the proposal to permit greater technical and operational flexibility to allow the 220-222 MHz operators to become more competitive with other wireless offerings classified as CMRS. Notably, AMTA concurred with the Commission's recommendation to permit aggregation of 5 kHz channels into wider channel bandwidth on a spectrally efficient basis and to remove regulatory restrictions that limit provision of paging, fixed and non-mobile services. On the other hand, SEA, Inc., the predominant manufacturer of 220 MHz equipment, vigorously implores the Commission to maintain current channelization rules in order to promote the development and use of narrowband technology. SEA views the Commission as having made prior commitments to the development of narrowband technologies for increasing spectrum efficiency, commitments relied upon by SEA, which has not been given the chance to amortize its investment in research, let alone profit therefrom. According to SEA, the removal of narrowband channelization requirements will deprive that company of a marketplace for its narrowband equipment, and the benefits of narrowband technology for efficient spectrum use will never be fully developed for the public.

Global believes that the continued development of narrowband technology, as pioneered by SEA, is in the public interest, in

order to promote, for example, the refarming of frequencies in congested land mobile bands. But local licenses are the relevant arena.

As the Commission has recognized, the development of local 220 MHz licenses has been along the lines of traditional SMR dispatch service. The provision of dispatch service at a low cost is now being deployed with the first successful use of SEA's narrowband technology. The introduction of a much higher infrastructure cost for digital technology (e.g., TDMA or CDMA) for local licensees might actually retard the growth of a 220 MHz narrowband local service. Nationwide and local 220 MHz systems are likely to develop in different ways. The nationwide licensees must now compete with five nationwide 900 MHz narrowband licenses and with others, and therefore must look beyond dispatch to advanced data applications in order to be viable. Therefore, flexibility of use, achieved by removing channelization restrictions to increase the rate and amounts of data that can be utilized, is extremely important to a truly nationwide deployment of facilities. Global thus supports the immediate removal of channelization, paging and other technical restrictions on the existing nationwide and future nationwide licenses as a first step.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Disparate treatment of nationwide licensees is justified here, because nationwide licensees, such as Global, always have been licensed with contiguous channels, which are amenable to CDMA and other spectrum-efficient non-narrowband technologies. In contrast, incumbent local trunked licenses are for non-contiguous channels, and are not good candidates for non-narrowband technologies.

To the extent that the Commission agrees with SEA that a continued spectrum setaside for narrowband is needed, then the non-nationwide frequencies are the most appropriate portion of the 220-222 MHz band to continue that setaside. The Commission can monitor and review the various uses made by the nationwide licensees of varying technologies, including narrowband, while giving the manufacturers a chance to further develop and deploy the narrowband technologies with local 220 licensees. This will best conduce to an orderly and continued development of narrowband technology, while allowing other technologies to also be deployed in the 220-222 MHz spectrum, particularly where it is essential to compete with providers in other frequency bands where there are no channelization requirements.

Respectfully submitted,

**GLOBAL CELLULAR COMMUNICATIONS, INC.**

By: Richard L. Brown  
Richard L. Brown

By: David J. Kaufman  
David J. Kaufman

October 12, 1995

Its Attorneys

Brown Nietert & Kaufman, Chartered  
1920 N Street, N.W., Suite 660  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 887-0600

RLB/GLOBAL HC

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, JacLyn Freeman, a secretary in the law offices of Brown Nietert & Kaufman, Chartered, hereby certify that I have, on this 27th day of September, 1995, caused a copy of the foregoing Reply Comments of Global Cellular Communications, Inc. to be sent via first class U.S. mail this 12th day of October, 1995 to each of the following:

Chairman Reed E. Hundt\*  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 814  
Washington, D.C. 20054

Commissioner James H. Quello\*  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 802  
Washington, D.C. 20054

Commissioner Andrew C. Barrett\*  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 826  
Washington, D.C. 20054

Commissioner Rachelle B. Chong\*  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 844  
Washington, D.C. 20054

Commissioner Susan Ness\*  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 832  
Washington, D.C. 20054

Regina Keeney, Chief\*  
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
2025 M Street, N.W., Room 5002  
Washington, D.C. 20054

John Cimko, Jr., Chief\*  
Policy Division  
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
2025 M Street, N.W., Room 5002  
Washington, D.C. 20054

Larry Atlas\*  
Associate Bureau Chief  
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
2025 M Street, N.W., Room 5002  
Washington, D.C. 20054

Martin D. Liebman\*  
Engineer  
Policy Division  
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
2025 M Street, N.W., Room 5002  
Washington, D.C. 20054

Alan R. Shark  
American Mobile Telecommunications Association  
1150 18th Street, N.W.  
Suite 250  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Elizabeth R. Sachs  
Gerald S. McGowan  
Thomas Gutierrez  
Lukas, McGowan, Nace & Gutierrez  
1111 19th Street, N.W.  
Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Eliot J. Greenwald  
Fisher Wayland Cooper Leader & Zaragoza  
2001 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20006

Thomas J. Keller  
Verner Liipfert Bernhard McPherson  
& Hand, Chartered  
901 15th Street, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005

William J. Franklin  
William J. Franklin, Chartered  
1919 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20006

Robert B. Kelly  
Kelly & Povich, P.C.  
Suite 300  
1101 30th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20007

Henry M. Rivera  
Larry S. Solomon  
Gregg A. Rothschild  
Ginsburg, Feldman & Bress  
1250 Connecticut Ave, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Judith St. Ledger-Roty  
Enrico C. Soriano  
Reed Smith Shaw & McClay  
1301 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 1100 - East Tower  
Washington, D.C. 20005

Richard C. Dean  
U.S. Central, Inc.  
Lehigh Tower  
East Rock Road  
Allentown, PA 18103

Jeffrey L. Sheldon  
UTC, The Telecommunications Association  
1140 Connecticut Ave., N.W.  
Suite 1140  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Jerome K. Blask  
Gurman Blask & Freeman  
1400 16th Street, N.W.  
Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20036

  
Jaclyn Freeman

\* Via hand delivery